



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,206	09/15/2003	Ananthram Subramanian	135538	2205
23413	7590	10/15/2004		
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002			EXAMINER DONOVAN, LINCOLN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2832	

DATE MAILED: 10/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/605,206

Applicant(s)

SUBRAMANIAN ET AL.

Examiner

Lincoln Donovan

Art Unit

2832

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,7-12,14-17 and 21-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 2-6,13,18-20 and 24-26 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the terminal connector projecting outwardly from the circuit breaker molded case must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: in paragraph 20, "U.S. Patent Application Number" should be corrected as --- U.S. Patent --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9-12 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 9-11, there is no antecedent basis for "said back wall." It appears that applicant intended claims 9-11 to depend upon claim 2.

Regarding claim 10, there is no antecedent basis for "said sidewalls."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 7, 14-16 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leone et al. [US 6,624,375] in view of Ferree et al. [US 6,172,586].

Regarding claims 1, 7, 14, 16 and 21-22, Leone et al. disclose a circuit breaker [10] comprising:

- a molded case [18];

- a strap terminal [12] extending from the case;
- a terminal connector lug [100] attached to the strap terminal, the terminal connector mounted on an outer portion of the case [figure 1]; and
- an insulator [80] discrete from the case disposed around the terminal connector and trapped within the case by attachment of the terminal connector to the strap terminal [figure 1].

Leone et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for the insulator being configured to be used with a plurality of different field installable terminal connectors.

Ferree et al. disclose a terminal barrier [140] for a multiphase circuit breaker [figure 1] able to accommodate various types of terminal connectors [column 9, lines 11-22].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the barrier of Leone et al. to accommodate different types of terminal connectors, as suggested by Ferree et al., for the purpose of enabling the barrier to be used with a plurality of types of breakers.

Regarding claim 15, Leone et al. disclose the instant claimed invention except for the insulator being used in a multiphase breaker.

Ferree et al. disclose the use of terminal barriers in multiphase breakers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the insulator design could have been incorporated in a multiphase breaker, as suggested by Ferree et al., for the purpose of protecting all of the phases.

Claims 8, 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leone et al., as modified, as applied to claims 1, 16 and 22 above, and further in view of Arnold et al. [US 4,965,418].

Leone et al., as modified, disclose the instant claimed invention except for the use of a gasket disposed over the strap terminal intermediate the case and insulator.

Arnold et al. disclose the use of a gasket [56] mounted about a strap terminal [15] in a multiphase breaker [figure 5].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a gasket between the insulator and case wall of Leone et al., as modified, for the purpose of protecting against arcing and gas leakage from the breaker.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-6, 13, 18-20 and 24-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 9-12 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hubbard et al. [US 5,488,337], Bausch et al. [US 5,811,749], Carothers [US 5,206,614], Hartzel et al. [US 5,753,877], Mrenna et al. [US 4,620,076], Palet Mercader et al. [US 6,733,347] and Little et al. [US 6,211,759].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lincoln Donovan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1988. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Elvin Enad can be reached on (571) 272-1990. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ldd


LINCOLN DONOVAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2100